



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,457	02/20/2001	Laurent Gavaille	19251	5028

26480 7590 01/13/2005

LAWRENCE E. LAUBSCHER, SR.  
LAUBSCHER LAW OFFICES  
1160 SPA ROAD  
SUITE 2B  
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21403

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,457

Applicant(s)

GAVOILLE, LAURENT

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1> Applicant's amendment and remarks have been received and reviewed. Claims 1-5 are presented for examination.

#### *Response to Arguments*

2> Applicant's arguments, see pages 4-6, filed 7.22.2004, with respect to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art detailed below.

3> Applicant's arguments with respect claim 2 and claim 3, filed 7.22.2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant is arguing in substance: (a) with respect to claim 2, Applicant asserts that the group identifier is not included in the message request that is transmitted from the terminal; and (b) that the Cafferelli patent is not in the same field of invention as the current application. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In regards to (a), Applicant is directed to [column 18 «lines 57-62»], where Matsubara clearly discloses that both the identifier and the group operation attribute is transmitted by the terminal.

In regards to (b), the use of the Cafferelli patent was relied upon only to teach the use of a packet (message) that includes a field that directs the terminal to construct a directory [Figure 8]. As packets are well known in the art, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to reasonably infer that the use of Cafferelli's packet structure would be applicable to a

Art Unit: 2152

wide variety of computer networks, whether it be Cafferelli's file directory service to store information about a compact disc or the Applicant's directory construction to store information about terminals.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5> Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsubara et al, U.S Patent No. 6,335,812 ["Matsubara"], in view of Matsuzaki, U.S Patent No. 4,998,248.

6> As to claim 1, Matsubara teaches a method of constructing directories in terminals connected by a local area network, said method including the following steps:

broadcasting a message from a given terminal in the network, the broadcast message containing at least an address of said given terminal (column 6, line 62 to column 7, line 9 and lines 58-65 and column 24, lines 30-41);

in at least one other terminal, decoding said broadcast message, extracting from it a name and an address of said given terminal and transmitting a response message containing the address of said given terminal as a receiver address and at least a name and an address of

Art Unit: 2152

said other terminal extracted from said broadcast message (column 8, lines 19 to column 10, line 19 and column 24, lines 21-54); and

decoding said response message in said given terminal, extracting said name and said address of said other terminal from the decoded response message, and inserting the extracted name and address in mapping relationship into a directory of said given terminal (column 10, line 20 to column 12, line 20 and column 24, lines 21-54).

Matsubara does not explicitly disclose including both a name and an address in the broadcast message. Also, while Matsubara does disclose creating a mapping relationship between a group name and address of a terminal, he does not explicitly disclose creating a mapping relationship between the name and address in a directory.

7> Matsuzaki discloses including both a name and an address in a broadcast message [column 4 «lines 41-46» | column 4 «line 65» to column 5 «line 3»] and creating a mapping relationship between the name and address in a directory [Figure 2 «item 32a» | column 3 «line 62» to column 4 «line 10» | column 4 «lines 41-46»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Matsubara's broadcast message and directory as Matsuzaki's broadcast message (name and address included in the message) and name/address mapping directory. As both Matsuzaki and Matsubara relate to identifying data terminals in a communications network, it would be further advantageous to modify Matsubara's broadcast message to include Matsuzaki's name/address broadcast message functionality to allow Matsubara's users to more specifically identify and address the terminals in a communications network [see Matsuzaki column 1 «lines 39-48»].

Art Unit: 2152

Also, since Matsubara already discloses creating a directory based on information in the message, it would have been obvious to modify Matsubara's directory to include Matsuzaki's name/address directory creation functionality to allow terminals to further distinguish other terminals in the network.

8> As to claim 2, Matsubara teaches a method wherein said given terminal and plural other terminals in said network define a group of terminals associated with an identifier, and said broadcast message includes said identifier so that only said plural other terminals decode said broadcast message to extract from it said name and said address of said given terminal (Figure 14, column 17, line 14 to column 18, line 12 and column 18, lines 57-62).

9> As to claim 5, Matsubara teaches a method wherein said broadcasting step follows on automatically from said given terminal connected to said network (column 8, lines 47-54, column 9, lines 14-29, column 23, lines 53-56 and column 24, lines 21-45).

10> Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsubara and Matsuzaki, in view of Caffarelli et al (hereinafter Caffarelli), U.S Patent No. 6,091,686.

11> Matsubara does teach the construction of a directory in response to the broadcast message and the response message (column 7, lines 2-42) but does specifically disclose the use of a directory construction function field included in the messages.

Art Unit: 2152

12> Caffarelli teaches a message that includes a directory construction function field (column 11, lines 18-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Matsubara's message to include the directory construction function field for the purposes of storing the information necessary to construct the directory by the receiving terminal.

13> Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsubara and Matsuzaki, in view of Okanoué, U.S Patent No. 6,134,587, in further view of Tello et al, U.S Patent No. 6,381,634 ["Tello"].

14> Matsubara teaches the use of a local area network, sender terminal addresses and broadcast and response messages (Figure 5, items Cs, C1, C2, C3 and abstract) but does not teach a method wherein said address contained in said broadcast message or in said response message includes at least an electronic mail address of said sender terminal.

15> Okanoué teaches a method wherein said address contained in said broadcast message or in said response message includes a sender terminal address conforming to the internet protocol address of said sender terminal (column 10, lines 49-52 and column 12, lines 6-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Matsubara's local area network, terminals and messages to conform to the standards of internet protocol so the terminals can communicate with each other over the internet.

Art Unit: 2152

It is well known in the art that IP addresses can represent an electronic mail address. For example, Tello discloses an IP header packet that includes an electronic mail address in the source IP address header [Figure 5 «item 622»]. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have reasonably inferred that Okanoue's IP address could be replaced with an electronic mail address as taught by Tello. One would have been motivated to perform such a replacement because electronic mail addresses are easier to read and understand by humans and therefore would allow a user to quickly identify the destination or source address of a terminal.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC

  
**ZARNI MAUNG**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**